



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,638	02/20/2004	Tomoko Adachi	00862.100124.	3438
5514	7590	09/23/2008		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			GELAGAY, SHIWAYE	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/23/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/781,638	Applicant(s) ADACHI, TOMOKO
	Examiner SHEWAYE GELAGAY	Art Unit 2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/8/08.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/8/08 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with filed 7/8/08 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20 state the limitation, "wherein the entering unit **can** enter, in a case where any of the user identification information displayed on the displaying unit is selected, the user identification information (emphasis added)". The

Art Unit: 2137

use of "can" implies that the entering unit is **able** to enter user identification information in the case where user identification information displayed is selected but **does not actually enter user identification in this case**. The entering unit could but it does not have to. If the entering unit **does**, in fact, enter user identification information, it is unclear when the case of user identification being selected occurs. The claims recite the limitation, "displaying unit configured to display user identification information based on the login history held in the holding unit." However, no user identification is ever selected and no selecting means is ever mentioned.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (hereinafter Kondo) US 5,684,957 in view of Snapper et al. (hereinafter Snapper) U.S. Patent No. 7,216,292.

As per claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20:

Kondo discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer-executable program for implementing a data processing method for displaying, on a data processing device, an entry screen for entering user identification information and password information, comprising the steps of:

storing, in a storage unit, user identification information and password information for each of a plurality of users, the user identification information and the password information being associated with each other;

setting information whether to hold user identification information which is to be used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen;

allowing a display unit to display the user identification information that is set to be held at said setting step on the entry screen;

entering, on the entry screen, user identification information and password information;

wherein the user identification information is entered in the entering step in a case where any of the displayed user identification information is selected (4:60-5:4 wherein a general user and privileged user constitute two types of users, 17:29-55 wherein a privileged user is the user type in which the login history is held without needing to be set and a general user's history is not automatically held).

Kondo does not explicitly disclose causing a holding unit to hold login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user; and allowing the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user. Snapper in analogous art, however, discloses causing a holding unit to hold login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user

to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user; and allowing the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user. (col. 16, lines 24-lien 61; *the user would be prompted to indicate whether the username/password should be stored or not for future use...the next time that user visits the same web site, he or she would not be prompted again*) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Kondo with Snapper in order to set for a user to allow a login history to be left in order to reduce the redundant information users must enter when logging into a system as taught by Snapper (3:10-21).

As per claims 2 and 11:

The combination of Kondo and Snapper teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said setting means provides user interface for allowing a user to set whether to leave a login history or not on a login screen presented to the user at a login operation (figs. 4A-C).

As per claims 4 and 13:

The combination of Kondo and Snapper teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said login histories are administered so as not to contain information on a user for a plurality of times (16:16-35).

As per claims 5 and 14:

The combination of Kondo and Snapper teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said authentication information contains classification information for classifying each user as the first type or the second type, and wherein said holding means holds login histories for each of said first type and said second type (15:54-65).

As per claims 7 and 16:

The combination of Kondo and Snapper teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Snapper further discloses a device wherein said setting means automatically sets login histories to be held for the users set as said first type and provides user interface allowing the users set as said second type to set whether to leave a login history or not on a login screen presented to the user at the login operation (15:54-65).

4. Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (hereinafter Kondo) US 5,684,957 in view of Snapper et al. (hereinafter Snapper) U.S. Patent No. 7,216,292 Kondo in view of Capps, U.S. Patent No. 5,666,502.

As per claims 3, 9, 12 and 18:

The combination of Kondo and Snapper teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose setting the number of users whose login histories are held and then holding that many. However, Capps discloses

Art Unit: 2137

setting the number 5 as the amount of names that can be held in the database (11:1-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to set a limit to the amount of names to be stored since if too many are accumulated it can be difficult for the user to make a selection quickly as taught by Capps (2:1-13).

As per claims 6 and 15:

The combination of Kondo and Snapper teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose setting a number of entries to be stored for each of two different types. However, Capps discloses a histories list being displayed for the different data fields, which are different types of information, and a limit to the number to be stored in each data field list (10:56-11:14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to set a limit to the amount of names to be stored since if too many are accumulated it can be difficult for the user to make a selection quickly as taught by Capps (2:1-13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWAYE GELAGAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137